LABOUR MONTHLY

Founded 1921 Editor: R. Palme Dutt

INTERNATIONAL UNITY & UNITY IN BRITAIN The Editor

TRADE UNIONS: HOUR OF DECISION

R. W. Briginshaw, Kevin Halpin & others

NORTHERN IRELAND

Betty Sinclair

Cheddi Jagan on Guyana

Ghana Today, Pat Sloan

Higher Education Curricula

JUNE 1969

3s. 6d.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LABOUR MONTHLY

Editor: R. Palme Dutt Associate Editor: R. Page Arnot

Managing Editor: Nicola Seyd

VOL. 51 No. 6 JUNE . 1969

CONTENTS

Page

Notes of the Month: International Unity and Unity in Britain. *Internationalism Lives!—Enemy Chorus—Warnings of History—Through Eclipse to New Triumphs—Offensives of Disruption Defeated—Indestructible Strength of Communist Internationalism—Stages of Growth—Problems of Growth—Different Paths to Socialism—Nationalism and Internationalism—Practical Tasks—Special Trades Union Congress* .. .. .. **R.P.D.** 241

Trade Unions: Hour of Decision. Preparations for TUC and steps to follow June 5. **Kevin Halpin, R. W. Briginshaw, A. M. Kavanagh, Eric Boon, Jock Nicolson, Ted Scott** 253

Forty Years Ago. The Right to Strike 254

Lenin on our Grandchildren and Capitalism 259

Scorpio Cartoon 264, 265

Strikers Fined by Industrial Court 266

Northern Ireland: What Next? Transformation of the political scene and need for support for civil rights movement **Betty Sinclair** 267

Guyana Prospect. Aims of the PPP in face of US domination of Guyana .. .. **Cheddi Jagan** 270

Future of Higher Education. A discussion on higher education curricula .. **Bob Williamson, Nick Wright, Willie Thompson** 275

Ghana Today. Reasons for the coup and the situation three years after .. .. **Pat Sloan** 281

Book Reviews: 'The Philosophy of World Revolution', Franz Marek: *John Lewis*; 'Select Bibliography of the History of the British Labour Movement 1760-1939', edited by Edmund Frow; 'The World Beyond the Charter', C. W. Jenks: *Gordon Schaffer*; 'Hegel's Science of Logic', translated by A. V. Miller: *R.P.D.* 285

A Powerful Weapon .. .. **Nicola Seyd** 288

Publications Received .. .. Inside back cover

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Notes of the Month

INTERNATIONAL UNITY AND UNITY IN BRITAIN

> **'Ours is the road of internationalism, and we must not leave this road.'**
>
> LEO FRANCKEL, Delegate of Labour of the Executive of the Paris Commune, 1871.

May 18, 1969

On June 5 two conferences of significance are due to meet. On this date is convened the International Conference of Communist and Workers' Parties, the first after nine years since the last meeting, which will assemble the representatives of the majority of communist parties in the world with the aim to strengthen unity in action in the common struggle against imperialism. On this same date is due to meet the Special Trades Union Congress, the first for half a century since the last one, with the task to concert the united resistance of the working class in order to defeat the anti-union legislation threatened by the Government with the support of Toryism and the employers. The parallel meeting of these two Conferences corresponds to the present character of the international and national situation. In the present era of world-wide advance of the working class, of socialism and of national liberation, the leaders of reaction are seeking by every means to halt and drive back this advance, to disrupt the ranks of the workers, to spread division among the countries of socialism and national liberation, to promote confusion and factional disorganisation among the left and young people newly awakening to the struggle, and to attack directly the organisations of the working class. The same offensive, however varied the form, is manifesting itself today equally on the international plane and in Britain. Against this offensive the unity and united action of the working class is the indispensable weapon.

Internationalism Lives!

Internationalism is the heart of the revolutionary tradition. Already the dawn of the democratic revolution was lit with the spirit of internationalism. Milton thundered for vengeance for the slaughtered saints in Piedmont against the Italian tyrant, just as

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Byron gave his life in Greece. The Frenchman Lafayette fought in the American revolution. The Englishman Thomas Paine fought in the American revolution, and was elected Deputy for Calais in the French Convention. But the internationalism of the bourgeois democratic revolution vanished into the cut-throat competition of bourgeois nationalism in the nineteenth century, and finally turned into its opposite with imperialism and the subjection of nations. The revolutionary tradition of internationalism was taken over by communism, which purged it of its preceding weakness by building it on the firm foundation of the common interests of the workers in all countries. Thus was inaugurated the new revolutionary principle of proletarian internationalism to win the way forward to the victory of socialism and communism and replace class society by the future world classless society. It is this principle which, reaching its scientific expression in the teachings of Marxism, has won extending support and confirmation through the experience of these past twelve decades. It is this principle which, carried forward by the teachings of Lenin in the modern era, has during the past half century won ever extending triumphs in the transformation of the world. Through all the obstacles, temporary setbacks and difficulties of an arduous and zig-zag path, this main historical line of advance has gone forward, and continues to go forward. The convening of the International Communist Conference this June is a step along this path, to strengthen the international communist co-operation and unity which is the indispensable instrument for the advance of all the peoples of the world.

Enemy Chorus

At once a babble of discordant voices sounds on every side. How is it possible to speak of international communist unity? Is not the international communist movement hopelessly rent with divisions and schisms and conflict between parties. What about China and the Sino-Soviet conflict? What about Yugoslavia? What about the public differences between parties with regard to Czechoslovakia? Is not the whole conception of a united international communist movement a shattered obsolete illusion from a past era? Not so fast. Certainly the enemy takes advantage, and has always taken advantage, of every sign of difference or divisions within the communist ranks, and trumpets it in triumph to the world as proof of the bankruptcy of the representatives of the new social order, just as at other times they are equally ready, when it suits their purpose, to paint in no less flaming colours gigantic scare pictures

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the ever advancing spectre of a supposed international conspiracy. When the present leadership in China presents a perspective, in the latest declaration of their theoretical organ, for the 'overthrow' of the 'bourgeois fascist' rulers of the Soviet Union (or 'social-fascist' or 'little Tsars', to use the terms of their latest Congress report), naturally such a sentiment strikes an answering chord in the hearts of the more bellicose spokesmen of western imperialism. Bonn responds to Peking. Strauss, the leader of West German militarism and expansionist aims, writes that, since 'Europeans should still regard the "red danger" as more dangerous than the "yellow danger",' therefore 'pragmatic thinking suggests' that 'our interests and those of China temporarily and partially coincide.' Strengthened currents for recognition develop in official circles in the United States. When a number of parties in Western Europe have expressed criticism of the action of the five Warsaw Pact socialist states in relation to the situation in Czechoslovakia, all the Western multi-millionaire press, radio and television have hastened to blazon such statements abroad with a scale of publicity not usually accorded to party statements, and possibly not out of love of the interests of the parties concerned. All this is the normal rough-and-tumble of the class struggle, and has always been, ever since the days of the Communist League, and still more since 1917, for the enemy to seek to take advantage of every sign of difference or division in the socialist camp. Certainly there are grave and serious differences today of concern to every communist. But when the enemy tries on this basis to present a picture of the disintegration and downfall of international communism, it is necessary to bring a little sense of perspective.

Warnings of History

The memories of these red-baiters and prophets of the final collapse of the international communist movement are too short. The international communist movement has never travelled a smooth and easy road, has constantly had to pass from one crisis to another, and has known darker and more difficult days than any of the negative features of the present situation. The First International, immediately after the glory of the Paris Commune, was wrecked by the anarchist factionalism of Bakunin and his 'International Social Democratic Alliance', which denounced the leadership of Marx and the General Council as representing 'authoritarianism' and 'dictatorship', called for 'a free federation of autonomous groups', and on this basis worked to disrupt the organisa-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion by internal factional methods. Marx fought and defeated at The Hague Congress in 1872 these disruptive and basically anti-working class doctrines, masquerading as 'left' and ultra-revolutionary (actually, as Marx said, 'a hash scraped together from the right and from the left'). The Hague Congress adopted decisions of lasting significance which defined the principles of internationalism, democratic centralism and the indispensable role of the independent political party of the working class. With these principles thus firmly established, Marx took the lead in moving and carrying the transfer of the headquarters to New York, in order that the International, having accomplished its historic initiating task, should not be torn to pieces by the disruption of leftist and anarchist factionalism, but should be wound up peacefully in the United States a few years later. Thus for seventeen years after the Hague Congress, and for thirteen years after the formal dissolution, there was no International.

The government publicists of the day could triumphantly proclaim, with their customary short sight, that the once feared International was dead and buried. In reality the seed was bearing its fruit. The new independent working class parties on the basis of Marxism, calling themselves Social-Democratic parties, were growing up and increasing in strength. With complete confidence Engels could write, at the moment of the apparent eclipse, in 1874: 'I believe that the next International, after Marx's writings have exercised their influence for some years, will be directly Communist, and will proclaim precisely our principles.' As often with the predictions of Marxism, the principle was fulfilled and proved correct by the historical outcome; but the fulfilment took longer than anticipated.

Through Eclipse to New Triumphs

The Second International flourished and grew for a quarter of a century, then ended in disaster. Lenin described its role and its collapse:

> The Second International (1889-1914) was an international organisation of the proletarian movement whose growth was in *breadth*, at the cost of a temporary fall in the revolutionary level, a temporary increase in the strength of opportunism, which in the end led to the disgraceful collapse of this International (Lenin, 'The Third International and Its Place in History', 1919).

With the outbreak of war in 1914 all the main Social-Democratic parties in all the leading countries involved, with the exception of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the majority Social-Democratic party in Russia, the Russian Bolshevik party, betrayed their pledges, threw internationalism overboard, and joined up with their imperialist masters to hound on the workers to mutual slaughter. That betrayal of internationalism cost ten million lives. None of the difficulties and problems of the present stage of the international movement could compare with the scale of that collapse. Every enemy voice proclaimed with gloating glee: 'Where now is your International? Where is your boasted international working class solidarity? They are all shooting each other in millions. Where is your model German Social-Democratic party? In league with the Kaiser. You see, it was all an illusion. Nationalism is proved stronger than internationalism.' But already by September 1914, Lenin was setting out plainly the path from this morass to build the Communist International. Lenin and the Bolsheviks, together with the minorities true to international socialism in all the warring countries, carried on the struggle. The victory of the working class socialist revolution in Russia in 1917, followed by the revolutionary upsurge overthrowing the regime of the Kaiser in Germany a year later, ended the war. All the active fighting forces of the previous Social-Democratic parties united with the Bolsheviks to found the Communist International, which proved far stronger, clearer in revolutionary consciousness and internationalism, and more world-wide in extent than the old Second International. History proved on the side of internationalism. After every setback international communism has advanced to new heights. When the Communist International was dissolved after nearly a quarter of a century, in 1943, it was dissolved, not from weakness, not from breakdown, but with the agreement and continuing internationalism of all its sections, because the very success of its work and the advance of the movement had outgrown the forms of a single centralised leadership and opened a new era of international communism.

Offensives of Disruption Defeated

Nor has there been any lack of offensives of disruption and critical testing times since 1917 and the foundation of the Communist International. Parallel with the direct assault of imperialism, through the wars of intervention, ceaseless anti-Soviet plotting, fascism and the Munichite policies, and the accompanying campaign of denunciation from Kautsky onwards by the leaders of right-wing Social-Democracy, there were also successive offensives of internal disruption within the communist ranks. Trotskyism built up its secret con-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

spiratorial organisation within the Soviet Union, called for the violent overthrow of the existing Soviet regime as having supposedly 'betrayed' the revolution, proclaimed its 'Fourth International' with the aim to split every existing communist party, and predicted the inevitable military defeat of the Soviet Union by Nazism unless the West European working class revolution took place first. But once again international communism proved stronger than its enemies and emerged from its testing ordeals with increased strength. It was not Nazism which inflicted military defeat on the Soviet Union, as Trotsky had calculated, but the Soviet Union which inflicted military defeat on Nazism. The 'Fourth International' dribbled into the sand, to disintegrate into a confusion of mutually squabbling grouplets. International communism has swept forward to increased strength, with a whole array of socialist states arising, and the sixty parties with three million members on the eve of the Second World War have become today over eighty parties with fifty million members. Certainly this vast expansion has been accompanied with new problems, difficulties, differences to be overcome. But the perspective of the whole development of the international communist movement gives every ground for confidence that these difficulties, however critical the moments of testing may prove, will be overcome, and the advance of the movement will continue to go forward.

Indestructible Strength of Communist Internationalism

The reason why this indestructible strength of communist internationalism has thus been proved by the historical record of the hundred and twenty years since the original *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, so that it has again and again through an ever changing world situation re-asserted itself like a law of gravity in the face of every temporary deviation and challenge and reverse, is because it is rooted in the conditions of class society, of the relations of capital and labour, and in the modern era the confrontation of the world of imperialism and of socialism and national liberation. Long ago the diplomat of the counter-revolutionary Holy Alliance of the old social order, Metternich, had proclaimed:

> Today, as in the past and for all time to come, two irreconcilable groups are in conflict in society: those who have and those who have not. (Prince Metternich, quoted in G. de B. de Sauvigny, *Metternich and His Times*, 1962).

That was before this elementary conception of the essence of revolution and counter-revolution had been clarified by the development of the working class and the definition of the class struggle.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

When Marx and Engels in the *Manifesto of the Communist Party* in 1848, the first formulation of the programme of communism, set themselves to answer the question wherein the Communist Party differs from other working class parties, they placed in the forefront this character of internationalism:

> The Communists are distinct from the other working class parties by this only: (1) In the national struggles of the proletariat of the different countries they point out and bring to the forefront the common interests of the entire proletariat independent of nationality.

The Rules of the First International in 1864 laid down the principle:

> The emancipation of labour is neither a local nor a national, but a social problem, embracing all countries in which modern society exists.

Lenin set out no less firmly, in 1913 on the eve of the First World War, the class basis of internationalism:

> Bourgeois nationalism and proletarian internationalism—these are the two irreconcilably hostile slogans that correspond to the two great class camps throughout the capitalist world, and express the *two* policies (nay, the two world outlooks) in the national question (Lenin, 'Critical Remarks on the National Question', 1913, *Collected Works*, English edition, Vol. 20, p. 26).

On the basis of this principle the movement has swept forward to extending advance over the world.

Stages of Growth

With each successive stage of advance in the transformation of the world, new social and political forms have arisen, and accompanying new problems have come to the forefront. During the nineteenth century, in the era of Marx and Engels, the main field of practical expression of working class internationalism within the conditions of capitalist ascendancy was through mutual aid and solidarity in strikes and daily struggles against the employers; and the records of the First International show the indefatigable role that it played, and the attention Marx gave to every detail, in the fulfilment of this responsibility. At the same time the principle of revolutionary internationalism received brilliant demonstration, not only by the entire work of political clarification through the Congresses and the General Council, but signally in the field of practice by the record of the Paris Commune, the first expression of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the participation of the members of the International from many nationalities in the Commune, and the campaign of the International in support of the Commune. With the victory of the first socialist revolution in 1917 a new era opened. The revolutionary

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

upsurge reached to all parts of the world. The old empires trembled. Internationalism found expression in the actions of solidarity of the widest sections of the workers with the young Soviet Republic to defeat the wars of intervention, in the foundation of the Communist International, and in the association henceforth of the struggles for national liberation against imperialism with the common advance of the socialist revolution. By 1920 the old slogan 'Workers of all countries, unite' was carried forward into the new slogan, set out in the magazine *Peoples of the East* and approved by Lenin, 'Workers of all countries and oppressed peoples, unite!'

Problems of Growth

Yet a further new era was opened by the victory of the liberation war of the peoples of the world, with the Soviet Union fulfilling the main role in the battle, for the defeat of fascism. A whole array of new socialist states replaced former regimes of reaction. The majority of the former colonial and dependent peoples became new independent states. Most of these new independent states proclaimed policies of non-alignment with imperialism, found a basis of co-operation with the socialist world, and began in many cases to experiment with their own paths towards socialist aims. Thus a picture of extreme variety and diversification of the rising new world has developed. It is understandable that in this complex process new differences and problems should arise. Yet the principle of internationalism is more than ever indispensable in this situation. International co-operation and unity in the common struggle against imperialism is a life-and-death question for all, since the offensive of imperialism is ceaselessly active, as the events of recent years have shown (Ghana, Indonesia, Greece) to strike at any weak point, and take advantage of any division, to turn back the advance of the peoples and install some new regimes of reaction.

Different Paths to Socialism

Lenin long ago pointed out that the future conditions of the path to the victory of the working class and socialism in other countries would not be the same as in the Soviet Union, which had to face the heaviest obstacles and the most implacable opposition as the pioneers of the socialist revolution.

> We had to exercise the dictatorship of the proletariat in its harshest form (Lenin, speech to Moscow Party Workers' Meeting, Nov. 27, 1918, *Collected Works*, English edition, Vol. 28, p. 207).
>
> Russia may have to make greater sacrifices than other countries; this is not

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> surprising considering the chaos that we inherited. Other countries will travel by a different, more humane road, but at the end of it lies the same Soviet power (Lenin, speech to Extraordinary Plenary Meeting of Moscow Soviet, April 3, 1919, *Collected Works*, English edition, Vol. 29, p. 271).

It will be noted that the formulation of the perspective of 'a different, more humane road' to socialism in other countries, after the harsh pioneering experience of the Soviet Union, is not some newly invented formula of Wilsonian social-democrats, presenting this conception as their alternative to the horrors of communism, and using this fig-leaf of a phrase to cover their real service to big capital. This formulation was first presented by Lenin half a century ago, in 1919, to describe his vision of the future 'different, more humane road' of other countries to socialism. But he did not fail to add that through all the variety of roads and forms the reality of the political power of the working class, or, as it was then expressed to make clear the distinction from bourgeois parliamentary hypocrisy, Soviet power, remains indispensable. Half a century of experience has now abundantly proved in practice this perspective presented by Lenin, with the multiplying variety of forms, according to varying national conditions and traditions, in the advance to socialism. But this experience has equally shown that any weakening of the indispensable common principle in all cases, the political power of the working class, leading the alliance of all the working people against imperialism and reaction, can endanger the whole advance, and even lead to a temporary victory of reaction and counter-revolution.

Nationalism and Internationalism

The workers of each nation, at the head of the broadest popular alliance, find their own path to socialism, in accordance with national conditions and traditions. But this national variation in the path to socialism does not mean nationalist separatism. 'National Socialism' was Hitler's invention. The advance within each country does not take place in a separate sealed-off compartment, cushioned off from the world, but is part of an international struggle against capital. This is the essential principle of working class internationalism, which distinguishes it equally from the hypocritical 'international' professions of bourgeois nationalism and imperialism (lip-service to the United Nations and 'world peace' to cover sectional military alliances in violation of the Charter and ceaseless local colonialist wars), or the well-intentioned internationalist aspirations of bourgeois philanthropy, like Oxfam, which seeks to alleviate the evil consequences of imperialism without combating imperialism. Lenin

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

defined the basic principle when he said: 'Proletarian internationalism demands . . . that the interests of the proletarian struggle in any one country should be subordinated to the interests of that struggle on a world scale,' and that the task of communists within each country is to seek out the nationally specific conditions so as to determine 'the concrete manner in which each country should tackle a *single* international task.' When the Left Communists at the time of the Brest-Litovsk peace negotiations in February 1918 opposed the signing of a peace, and advocated a 'revolutionary war' against German imperialism, they argued that it could be 'expedient' to 'lose Soviet power' in order to assist the German revolution. Did Lenin reply that it was outrageous to suggest the possibility of sacrificing the national interests of the Soviet Union in order to serve the international revolution? Not at all. He replied in his famous article, 'Strange and Monstrous':

> It is quite conceivable that, given these premises, it would not only be 'expedient' (as the authors of the resolution put it) but a downright *duty* to accept the possibility of defeat and the possibility of the loss of Soviet power. But obviously these premises do not exist. The German revolution is ripening, but it has obviously not reached the stage of an explosion in Germany, of civil war in Germany. By 'accepting the possibility of losing Soviet power', we certainly would not be helping the German revolution to reach maturity, but *would be hindering* it. We would be helping German reaction.

In other words, the *principle* of the priority of international obligation over the short-term national interests of the working class struggle in a particular country was not disputed by Lenin. It was the factual analysis that was in dispute. This principle is all the more important today, when a wide range of socialist states exist in the world, whose co-operation and unbreakable unity, in association with the working class at different stages of advance in the various capitalist countries, and alongside the newly independent states resisting imperialism, is all the more indispensable, since the socialist sector is still the minority sector in the world, and imperialism is ceaselessly on the warpath.

Path of International Co-operation

In this situation, with consciousness of the differences and divisions still existing in the international communist world and needing to be eventually resolved, the parties convening the international communist conference this June have wisely chosen a modest immediate objective, not to attempt at this stage to thrash out the issues of difference, but to concentrate on promoting co-operation for the recognised common immediate objectives in the struggle

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

against imperialism. When Marx prepared the programme for the London delegation to the First Congress of the First International at Geneva in 1866, he described in a letter the realist tactical line he had deliberately chosen:

> I deliberately restricted it to those points which allow of immediate agreement and concerted action by the workers, and give direct nourishment and impetus to the requirements of the class struggle and the organisation of the workers into a class (Marx, letter to L. Kugelmann, October 9, 1866).

Recognising the wide differences which then existed in the stage of development and outlook of the working class movement in the different countries, Marx saw in 'community of action' and 'exchange of ideas' the best line of approach towards closer common theoretical understanding:

> As the stage of development reached by different sections of workers in the same country and by the working class in different countries necessarily varies very much, the actual movement necessarily expresses itself in very diverse theoretical forms.
>
> The community of action which the International Working Men's Association called into being, the exchange of ideas by means of the different organs of the sections in all countries, and finally the direct discussions at the General Congresses will by degrees create for the general workers' movement its common theoretical programme also (Marx, letter to Engels, March 5, 1869).

Today a far more advanced stage has been reached in the whole development of the movement. The platform of Marxism-Leninism is recognised in principle by all sections, even though there are in some cases differences of interpretation. Under these conditions to promote and strengthen international co-operation on agreed objectives, and to hinder as far as possible the still unresolved differences from weakening such vitally essential co-operation, the agenda of this international communist conference has been concentrated on the single item: 'The Tasks in the Struggle against Imperialism in the Present Stage and the Unity of Action of the Communist and Workers' Parties and of All the Anti-Imperialist Forces.'

Practical Tasks

A theorist might argue that, since imperialism is the modern form of capitalism, this item might be interpreted to imply a complete analysis of the modern world situation, and of all the strategical and tactical conclusions to be drawn from such an analysis, in the same manner as was done at the 1957 and 1960 meetings. But the practical purpose intended by the agenda, and its deliberate limitation is clear. The present immediate international situation is serious

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and dangerous. The areas of tension, reflecting the offensive of the aggressive forces of imperialism, are manifest: in the Middle East; in South East Asia; in Central and Southern Africa; in Europe with the advance of rearmed German militarism and neo-Nazism; and in the whole sphere of the arms race and nuclear armaments. Unity from the side of the peoples to confront these dangers is essential. The aim of the Conference will be to promote such unity of action. All supporters of socialism and peace will wish this Conference success in the fulfilment of this task.

Special Trades Union Congress

The responsibility of the Special Trades Union Congress to be held on June 5 is the heaviest since the formation of the Councils of Action in 1920, the launching of the General Strike in 1926, and the events of 1931. Every attempt is being made, with all the most high-powered machinery of publicity, governmental pressure, and manoeuvring within the General Council, to confuse the issue, bamboozle the delegates with all kinds of mock 'alternatives' and 'compromises', stultify the purpose of the Special Congress, and in general persuade the chicken to cut its own throat. The first obligation on every delegate is not to be bamboozled. The reason for this unparalleled high-pressure campaign is obvious. It is the strength of resistance of the organised workers, and above all the industrial action of a quarter of a million key workers on May 1, which has created panic in high places. The Cabinet is in disarray; each successive measure of renewed attack on the workers, the increased health charges, the £430 million insurance imposition to pay for the Budget boast of £250 million increased pensions, the grovelling Declaration of Intent to the International Monetary Fund, with refusal to disclose its contents to parliament until after signature, all have come tumbling out with such confusion even of announcement as has made manifest to the entire people the utter bankruptcy of a Government which calls itself Labour, but violates every principle of the labour movement and directs its main fire against the labour movement. Resistance by union action is now the key to the future, not only for trade unionism, but for the whole political labour movement. The language of action is the only language these fomenters of the anti-union offensive understand. This is a test of strength, of class strength. On this Special TUC rests the responsibility to mobilise the full strength of the organised working class to defeat this anti-union offensive and save the future of the labour movement. **R.P.D.**

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

TRADE UNIONS: HOUR OF DECISION (1)

Kevin Halpin
Chairman, Liaison Committee for the Defence of Trade Unions

THE Government's interference in the trade unions and the opposition to these measures has laid the basis for the greatest unity in years. How has it developed?

The Liaison Committee for the Defence of Trade Unions was formed by certain London sites, factories and docks four years ago to oppose government interference. This committee now has its counterpart in every industrial centre; these have been set up by trade union officials in unity with stewards. At the beginning, this movement was condemned by officials, but the last conference had speakers and messages from the presidents of the most influential unions in the country. This conference called for condemnation of *In Place of Strife* and for a recall of the TUC, with the stoppage and demonstration on May 1. How far would we succeed?

This was soon answered on April 30. Previously the monopoly press had tried to ignore our action. This time they couldn't. On May Day there would not be any papers. That evening television showed the mass pickets, men and women, outside the Fleet Street newspaper buildings with placards opposing *In Place of Strife*, proving that the Society of Graphical and Allied Trades (SOGAT) meant business. This was the best last-minute reminder for May 1 that we could have had. The London SOGAT closed Fleet Street but not before the newspaper proprietors had used their columns to attack the strike. 'It is between you and the Government. Nothing to do with us. It is a political strike.' This from people who had used their columns to attack trade unionists for years. From people who had screamed for the very measures that the strike was opposing. What crocodile tears! The print workers' stoppage was the reply they deserved.

May the First at the assembly place, Tower Hill: by eight o'clock the area was already showing many banners. The feeling, as chairman, as always before a meeting—'How many? Will it flop?'—quickly dispelled.

SOGAT members in force with their picketing banners of last night. Mike set up. From then on a constant stream of enquiries: Where is this chapel's crowd? Where is this factory, branch, site? Glorious weather. Could we move the crowd down a bit? Make

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

room for a band? A space for the engineers, builders, markets, to line up? Where should sheetmetal go?—draughtsmen, technicians and dozens more. The mike was too busy to do much but sort out the march. Tower Hill crowded—and how shrewd the pioneers of the 1889 dockers' fight: what an eye for a pitch! All the lot could be seen from the top—a natural for a mass meeting of thousands.

Everyone lined up waiting for the stevedores, dockers and lightermen. They are marching from Surrey Docks, and six miles from the Royal Docks. They deserve to lead the march. Their banners appear, led by the magnificent 100-year-old banner of the Coal, Corn and Timber Porters. The stevedores and dockers (NASD) united with lightermen. The march is off.

The march of 15,000 took 50 minutes to get away. The marshals had it well in hand. Down through the City, led by a band and with the members making sure that the Gnomes of London got the message: 'No profit in interfering with trade union rights.' Along to the TUC to deliver the message: 'No interference with the unions . . . One Day National Strike to bring this Government to its senses.' The message was delivered to Vic Feather whilst thousands waited, amazed that the TUC staff also had the day off. Maybe they were showing solidarity.

The march then continued to Lincoln's Inn Fields with a mass meeting. This was addressed by the main union speakers: Bill

---

LABOUR MONTHLY FORTY YEARS AGO

The Right to Strike

The events of the First of May and of the following days in Berlin are of great importance in the development of the class struggle of the German—indeed, of the world working class . . .

The German working class is today in a much worse economic situation than it was before the world war. Real wages are lower than in 1913. The eight-hour day has been abolished, partly with the help of the Social-Democrats, and a process of murderous rationalisation has been carried out in all factories in order to restore the competitive capacity of German industrial products in the world market. The workers have 'reaped the harvest' of this rationalisation in a tremendous increase in the degree of exploitation, which even bourgeois economists have calculated to be, on the average, an increase of 30 per cent. In these efforts to fetter the working class the Social-Democrats have worked hand-in-hand with the bourgeoisie. It was the Social-Democrats who instituted the arbitration guillotine, which in practice amounts to a prohibition of the workers' right to strike.

(From 'Sharpening Class War in Germany', by Wilhelm Pieck, *Labour Monthly*, June 1929.)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Keys, SOGAT; Bill Lindley, lightermen; Ron Webb, NASD; Bill McLaughlin, engineers; Jack Dash, transport; and building worker Max Beyer. And MPs Stan Orme and Stan Newens. They all affirmed opposition to *In Place of Strife* and called for a united fight to defeat it.

The following resolution was put:

> This demonstration of London trade unionists against the Government's White Paper, *In Place of Strife*, calls on the TUC General Council to put on the agenda of the TUC on June 5 the mobilising of the movement against the Bill, with a request to stage a one day general strike.
>
> It further calls on all trade unionists to make a day of action, and lobby the TUC and parliament on June 5.
>
> We further warn the Government that, unless the attack on trade unions is dropped, we will use all means, including total stoppage of industry, until we are assured that the trade unions will remain free to decide how and when to withdraw labour to defend our interests.

This was carried with a roar, no one against. The meeting then broke up for refreshments before going to parliament. Refreshments! It is claimed that one of the stevedores who carried the banner twelve miles downed four pints without tasting them.

London had 15,000 on the march. But this was multiplied in Merseyside, Manchester, Glasgow, Hull, Sheffield, Birmingham, Coventry, Wolverhampton and many other places. Marches, meetings, addressed by trade unionists and MPs on united platforms.

The press and television, with the honourable exception of the *Morning Star*, tried to play it down. Contrast the treatment any small dispute gets: played up—'ruining the economy,' and so on. This one, involving a quarter of a million, the largest stoppage against any political measure for years, was played down.

Now for the future. Well, the TUC is recalled; Wilson and Castle have suggested that they come up with an alternative to *In Place of Strife* that will do the same job. This is like giving a man the option of jumping off a cliff or being pushed. No alternative is any good if it does the same job, if it perpetuates and sharpens government policies of preventing trade unionists using their strength to get better wages and conditions. This new attack is the continuation of wages policies: unpaid wage advances gone to shareholders, 25 per cent increase in profits in the last quarter of 1968. That is why we must look to the next stage.

May the First must lead to the biggest lobby on June 5 at Croydon. Wider representation is needed for lobbying. Make sure all TUC delegates are seen now and on the day, so that not only is *In Place of Strife* condemned but this Government is told that if they go ahead

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

there will be national strikes. That if they still intend to present a bill in June, then the date of the second reading should be the cry for the biggest protest ever. Meantime, all local MPs should be seen and told to oppose now. This bill can be defeated and unity established to advance in Britain. The voice of the trade unions must be listened to and Wilson's Government prevented from political assassination of the movement which put him where he is.

---

(2)

SOGAT Executive Council Statement

R. W. Briginshaw
Joint General Secretary

THE Executive Council of the Society of Graphical and Allied Trades at their meeting on May 6, 1969, gave careful consideration to a report from the Joint General Secretary on events that had taken place within the industry, arising from government proposals which would result in penalisation of trade unionists. They particularly gave attention to the stoppages of work that occurred on April 30 and May 1. They reiterated their opposition to the Government's proposals as contained in the White Paper *In Place of Strife*. They decided to call upon the TUC to give consideration to recommending to affiliated organisations a 24-hour national stoppage in protest against the Government's proposals, if the Government persists with its plans to translate the proposed penalisations into law. . . .

They decided to re-emphasise for members the reasons why the Executive Council originally on February 4 had taken up the policy position of a rejection of the government proposals, as outlined in the White Paper *In Place of Strife*. The TUC General Council has also rejected the penalisation and restrictive proposals in that document, and it is expected that the Special Congress of the TUC, to be held on June 5, will also heartily endorse the position taken up by the General Council of the TUC in this connection.

The Executive Council considers the Government is grossly at fault in not having taken sufficient notice of TUC representations in this connection. It is considered that the Government has allowed itself to be swayed and panicked by press and mass media campaigns against the trade unions in this country over a lengthy period. They have set up a false picture of the so-called trade union problem, and then have pressed the Government to do something about the very bogey that they erected.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Executive Council rejects the notion that the trade unions or their members are responsible for Britain's industrial, economic and financial problems. These result directly from misgovernment during the post Second World War years, and the actions of trade unionists and trade unions have in effect been reactions to the continued rise in the cost of living and various governments seeking to solve their problems at the expense of the people in this country. Britain has no need for shame that it has a sterling balance of payments problem. This arises from our contributions in the Second World War, and was incurred in overseas countries for that purpose. Britain, on its total national account, is not bankrupt, and therefore it is for the politicians to solve their problems and not to place the blame on the trade unions and trade unionists. For these reasons, together with many others, the Executive Council of this Society rejects the situation which can lead to genuine work people in their trade unions being penalised to the point which, in finality, either leads to a fine in a court of law, or to an attachment on the wages of employees.

The *Daily Mirror* was recently asked by one of their contributors, and we ask it again:

> Do they approve for instance of a situation where a worker should have a gummed slip attached to his P.45 form, disclosing to all employers that his earnings have been attached?

Our Executive Council say that they believe this would create a blacklist situation that has no place in a modern industrial set-up. This union and its predecessors rejected Victorian blacklisting, and it will not have it reinstated.

In drawing attention to our obligations under our own Rules and agreements with employers, we clearly state that we will struggle against all campaigns to seek to remove from us the right to strike. We see the right to strike as a last resort weapon, and it is because we cannot see it as a toy that we draw these attentions, invoking a full sense of responsibility over the whole of our membership in supporting the general line of the Executive Council in its policy approach to these matters affecting our trade union, and to the mechanics of operation. The Executive Council of this Society is elected by the membership to seek adherence to the Rules, to take policy decisions, to call for their operation and to act in the interests of the whole of the membership and the whole of the organisation. If it were to say otherwise, it would be shirking the responsibilities laid upon it as a democratic organisation.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(3)

A. M. Kavanagh
Assistant Divisional Organiser 26,
Amalgamated Union of Engineering & Foundry Workers

THE movement of the working people against anti-trade union legislation is gathering momentum as we approach June 5, the date of the TUC meeting. It is interesting to note the number of basic organisations going on record alongside national bodies: trade union branches, shop stewards' organisations, factory and district meetings reflect an increasing interest in view of the Government's stupidity in pressing on with the proposed legislation.

The complexities of the theorists is giving way to some simple basic issues. The right to strike is likely to be restricted. Trade unions and trade unionists would be no longer free in the traditional sense and an attempt is being made to place working people into restrictive tailor-made procedures and so, we are told, avoid disputes. It is not difficult to work out nice procedures into which people ought to fit. Industrial relations are full of such procedures, from the York Memorandum to simple company procedure agreements. The problem arises when a given issue comes to a head and something quickly has to be done about it.

If workers feel that the only way to get justice is to withdraw their labour, they will do so with or without the proposed legislation. Is not this the experience in countries abroad which have such legislation? Organised workers will strike when they have had enough. Restructuring industrial relations, as is proposed, will have little effect if justice and reason demand that striking is the only means to achieve an acceptable solution to a given problem. People cannot be stereotyped and placed in nicely worked-out procedures in such circumstances. If an issue blows up like the sacking of a good shop steward and injustice is apparent, then action is inevitable and all too frequently it is the only means to secure justice rapidly and at job level.

Too often we find elaborate procedural agreements are merely a cover for delay. Each stage is considered a further means to hold up a settlement. Meanwhile, the problem moves further from the job as the procedure is followed. In many cases, having completed the procedure, the problem is then referred back to job level for settlement. Thus the circle is complete, the procedure meticulously followed and we go back to where we started from.

Seen in this context, it might perhaps be more appropriate to conduct research into these areas where very simple procedures

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

operate. In other words, if an employer knows he has not a number of time-wasting devices, called procedures, which he can utilise, he would want to settle quickly and at job level. Thus the question really is: Are there more strikes where the simple procedures operate or where the most elaborate operate?

I would like to see more research on this question rather than trying to force workers, by penal clauses, into the framework of the proposed legislation.

Basically, however, I do not believe the legislation will work. The right to withdraw labour is fundamental. To accept restrictions on that right would be a disservice to working people. Fortunately the trade unions have recognised the danger inherent in the proposed legislation. Already many powerful trade unions have reiterated their opposition. Rank and file activity is growing. The Parliamentary Labour Party is reflecting this growing movement, which is felt even inside the Cabinet.

The TUC meeting on June 5 will focus further attention on the question. If, in face of this, the Cabinet, with the assistance of the Tories, are silly enough to place legislation on the statute book, there is little doubt, to my mind, that trade unionists will go on striking when reason and justice is on their side. The first of them to do so will have the undoubted support of the mass of the people of this country.

Arbitration Order 1305 was made ineffective and eventually withdrawn mainly by rank and file activity. So will any future legislation.

Towards the Lenin Centenary

Lenin on our Grandchildren and Capitalism

Our grandchildren will look at the documents and monuments of the epoch of the capitalist system as though they were monstrosities. It will be difficult for them to picture to themselves how trade in elementary necessities could be in private hands, how factories and works could belong to individuals, how one man could exploit another, how it was possible for those who did not work to exist. Up to now people talked of what our children would see in the future as though it were a fairy tale. But today, comrades, you clearly see that the edifice of socialist society of which we have laid the foundations is not a Utopia. Our children will build that edifice with even greater zeal.

Lenin, speech on Red Square, May 1, 1919.
(*Collected Works*, English edition, Vol. 29, p. 330.)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(4)

Eric Boon

Member of the Clerical and Administrative Workers' Union

I SUPPOSE before I comment on Barbara Castle's white paper *In Place of Strife* it would be useful if I could clear away any misconceptions as to the type of person one has in mind when one talks about the 'white collar worker'. I have in mind, chiefly, the thousands of white collar workers in the engineering industry in which I am employed, the various grades of supervision, draughtsmen, those employed on production planning, shop loading, costing, progressing, time checking, accounts clerks, material controllers, comptometer operators, wages clerks, to mention only some without whose work no industrial concern could exist. There is extremely keen competition between various unions to recruit these workers, for their importance as a force when looking for bargaining strength has long since been recognised.

One reason I think for the tremendous growth in militancy during the last few years, has been the very close proximity of white collar workers in industry to the manual workers. They have seen what organised strength can achieve at first hand. Listen to one of our union representatives speaking at a meeting I attended last month: '500 of our members held a meeting last week and walked out for one and a half days demanding an immediate increase of £5 per week.' The strike he was referring to took place at the British Motor Corporation service depot, Oxford. Listen again: 'What one has to remember is that they are constantly looking out of the windows seeing manual workers holding meetings and getting results—that they are not prepared to wait.' They've had enough waiting!

Listen to another speaker from another engineering factory at Weybridge: 'Our time-clerks are demanding another £2 10s. per week and intend to withdraw their labour if it is not granted.' No thoughts here about waiting for Barbara's opinion! And of course as the economic policies of the Government begin to bite so will the resistance build up. If the Labour Government thinks that trade unionists will meekly submit to attacks on their living standards carried out at the behest of those constituting the International Monetary Fund, I think they are in for a shock. All this of course places the right wing of the trade union movement in a very difficult situation. For example, how to support *In Place of Strife* and the threat to fine workers by attachment of earnings, which is deduction of money from their pay packets and, at the same time, prevent

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

members leaving their union? I personally don't think the 500 clerks at BMC will worry very much about the Bridlington* agreement if their union does not support them in their struggle.

When one looks at these situations, it is easy to understand why the employers and their friends in parliament are trying to rush through legislation calling for legal curbs against the unions. You will notice there is no talk of legal action against the Arnold Weinstocks of our society. It is of course quite in order for him to take over a whole combine throwing thousands out of work in the process without thought of the social consequences involved for the families of the people affected, as long as it serves the interest of profit.

White collar workers today are under constant attack. The salary structures in industry are being continually changed. It is being so arranged that all those occupying the positions of supervision, in order to obtain salary increases for themselves, have to demonstrate that they are running their departments cheaper and more efficiently than in the past. Statistics are kept showing the output per department and in order to get an increase supervisors have to show how much they have saved for the company, which means of course increased exploitation of the people employed and non-replacement of people who have left. A key weapon today is what has become known as 'group capacity assessment', under which the staff are divided into groups, their work is timed with a stop watch, and each group is given its work load and has to fill in a report sheet at the end of each day, points being allowed for each task. Who said slavery had been abolished! I was one of the trade union representatives at Rolls-Royce, London, who had this system explained in order that we could sell it to the members. One chap kept on saying: 'All we really want to see is that everyone is doing a fair day's work.'

I shall never forget the look on his face when I said: 'I think it's a good idea except that you have started at the wrong place.'

'What do you mean?' came the reply.

'You should start on the main board. Some of those people are directors of 14 different companies. They're only part-time workers!'

I mention all these things just to give readers an idea of the sort of climate that exists all over the country today. Every trick in the book is tried to con the workers that all these new measures and gimmicks are in their interest. The White Paper is the biggest con trick of all. One looks in vain to find where Barbara Castle is going to give trade unionists the right to say how profits should be distributed! The right wing are on the defensive, they know that people

* TUC agreement forbidding poaching of union members.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

who are experiencing increases in rent, mortgage interest charges, constantly rising prices, are not being taken in by talk of existing government policy helping the low paid worker. It does not require much intelligence to see the injustice of no curbs on prices but a three and a half per cent ceiling on salary increases.

We must of course continue to be on guard against the same meat but different gravy, and I would like to appeal to all those who read this article, to redouble their efforts in their trade unions to ensure that this White Paper never reaches the statute book.

---

(5) Jock Nicolson

Excutive Committee Member, North-West London District Council, National Union of Railwaymen

EVERYONE knows that it was the trade unions who created the Labour Party at the beginning of the century to enlarge their legal rights through parliament. But independent Labour representation in parliament came about largely through the initiative of the then existing socialist bodies, who succeeded in politicising the unions and breaking them away from subordination to the Liberal Party.

In recent years it has become fashionable for right-wing Labour theorists to try to reverse this process. The Parliamentary Labour Party would handle politics and the trade unions should confine themselves to industrial matters. This process has gone so far that a small Cabinet clique has acquired a divine right to determine Labour policies—and if the trade unions don't realise this is all to their good, it is because they haven't read the Government's White Paper!

Fortunately they have read it and are at last wakening up to what is being done to them: Not only are their most important industrial rights being taken from them, so also are they being deprived of their political rights in the Labour Party they created.

After the debacle caused by MacDonald in 1931, the TUC stepped in and prevented the disintegration of the Labour Party. It looks as though they will have to do the same again to halt the damage being done by Harold Wilson.

And, just as in the formative period it needed the socialists to win the unions away from the Liberals, so today it needs the combined effort of socialists and communists to make the unions even more political so that the interests of the millions of trade unionists paying the political levy determine Labour policy.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(6)

Ted Scott

Sheffield District President and
National Committee Delegate, Amalgamated Engineering Union

'YOU can fool some of the people all the time, all of the people some of the time, but you can't fool all of the people all of the time.' Apt and very relevant to the times we are living in. The big lie technique surrounding the proposed White Paper *In Place of Strife* is now being increasingly challenged by the trade union movement.

Examples of this challenge are the rejection by the 1968 TUC and Labour Party Conference of interference in trade union affairs, the hundreds and hundreds of resolutions submitted by the rank and file to the various executives of many unions and the demonstrations of February 27 and May 1. In Sheffield on May 1, some 17 factories with 20,000 workers stopped work for the day; in Manchester, Liverpool, London and other cities 200,000 workers demonstrated their complete opposition to the proposed act of legislation by a day's token stoppage of work.

What are the workers afraid of? Is it just the penal clauses that could be used to impound wages in default of paying fines, the cooling off period before taking strike action, the 28 days notice needed before action can be taken to settle outstanding grievances? Or is it that the whole of our experience over the last three years of the Prices and Incomes Act, which, far from doing what it was suggested (control prices and profits as well as wages, and assist the lower paid worker to get social justice), has taught us that the only thing that was controlled was in fact the wage packet. Has this experience made us so cynical that we are unable to recognise acts which are allegedly in our own interest?

In Place of Strife, in spite of assurances to the contrary by the Minister for Employment and Productivity, is an attempt to make the discredited Prices and Incomes Board work, by preventing the worker engaging in struggle to defend shop stewards against victimisation, improve the wage packet and generally to enjoy better living standards.

There are many more clauses than the three already mentioned, as a close study of the document would illustrate, that would put the clock back 100 years as far as the trade union movement is concerned. For example, the compulsory registration of trade unions, with rules amended to suit the Registrar General; a national

(Continued on page 266)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

'The greatest advance in trad
HAROLD WILSON, *May Day sp*

"
And cried "all hail!" w
SHAKESPEARE

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ɔn legislation in this century.'

at the Festival Hall, May 4, 1969.

ıdas kissed his master

s he meant all harm.'

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ballot, with the wording of the ballot paper approved by the Minister (one can visualise the sort of press campaign superseding this action!); the making of agreements enforceable by law (shades of Fords!); registration of agreements. These and many more clauses would tie the shop stewards hand and foot, even in the well organised factories, and would make it practically impossible to resist speed-up and bargaining on the basis of increased living costs or profits.

The Amalgamated Engineering Union National Committee, at their recent Conference carried a resolution rejecting the White Paper in its entirety and went on to say the AEU should campaign through the TUC and Labour Party to get this document and any similar one rejected. This was a progressive decision but the mere act of passing resolutions will not in itself constitute a threat that will affect government thinking.

What is needed now is for the whole of the trade union and Labour movement to be brought into discussion in order to be made fully aware of what the ramifications of *In Place of Strife* mean.

Demonstrations by the rank and file have already been undertaken; many more will be needed. We must, arising from our experience of February 27 and May 1, develop more unity and understanding at our places of work, in order to develop the maximum understanding of what needs to be done. We need to fight for the biggest lobby of the TUC on June 5 at Croydon in order to demonstrate our complete opposition to *In Place of Strife* or any other legislation even of the voluntary type being considered by the TUC General Council.

The AEU militant address says: 'Your duty to yourself and your class is to defend its heritage,' the heritage of class consciousness which has led us to accept responsibilities either as shop stewards or officials of our union. We shall do this best if we retain our loyalty to the people who elected us and not be distracted by so-called loyalty to individuals.

STRIKERS FINED BY INDUSTRIAL COURT

'The Swedish Labour Court yesterday ordered 206 workers to pay £2,518 damages and costs to their employers, the Boliden company, for illegally striking last November.

'Each of 143 workers who struck for the whole day pays £12 damages and £1. 12s. costs. The other 63 who struck for half the day each pay £8 damages and £1.12s. costs.

'The decision of the Labour Court, consisting of two union and two employers' representatives and three jurists, was unanimous.'

(*The Daily Telegraph*, April 18, 1969.)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NORTHERN IRELAND: WHAT NEXT?

Betty Sinclair

Secretary, Belfast Trades Council

IN previous articles, 'Northern Ireland: The Battle for Civil Rights' (in November 1968) and 'Aftermath of Derry' (in December), the background has been given of the developing political situation in Northern Ireland.

From 1949 the Unionist Party has maintained repressive legislation such as the Civil Authorities (Special Powers) Act, 1922, the Public Order Act, 1956, an armed police force (over 3,000) and an armed Special Constabulary (can be augmented upwards of 50,000) mainly recruited from the sources most inimical to the minority. (No member of the minority has ever been known to be a member of the Special Constabulary.) In the background, always, there has been maintained garrisons of the British Army, ostensibly in Britain's interest alone but which could be put at the disposal of the Northern Ireland authorities, with the consent and permission, of course, of Westminster.

In this setting, the position of the Unionist Party, placing its reliance on the home and British armed forces and placation, as far as possible, in the allocation of jobs, houses, contracts, to the Protestant majority, has reigned supreme. Its monolithic character, its unity, has been the envy of the rulers of other countries who also had minorities to contend with.

This whole set-up was challenged in August 1968. A large section of the anti-Unionist forces went into the streets and roads of Northern Ireland demanding an end to all forms of discrimination in the allocation of jobs and local authority housing, the repeal of the Special Powers Act and an act to end religious discrimination, on the lines of the British Race Relations Act—in effect, a demand for the same democratic rights and civil liberties as enjoyed by the people in the rest of the United Kingdom.

Such was the simple and elementary programme of the Civil Rights Association. After an attempt to brutally suppress the movement on the streets of Londonderry on October 5, 1968, the whole of Ireland, the people of Britain and the world learnt of the true conditions in Northern Ireland and just how 'democratic' were its rulers. The people asked for 'British justice' and they got a confrontation with armed police regulars, the specially trained

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

police riot squad, water cannon and batons and, for three nights following, an attempted terrorisation of the Catholic people of Londonderry.

An action that was calculated to put down, brutally, the demand for civil liberties, aroused the conscience of the people, and the fire of indignation was well and truly lighted. The world press, radio and television came to find out what was happening; Northern Ireland had become world politics. The Westminster and Stormont carpets were rolled back and the dirt that had accumulated beneath for half a century was revealed for the first time.

In November 1968, O'Neill was forced to announce a programme of 'concessions' to the civil rights movement. Nothing was conceded on the demand for one man one vote for local government. This, stated O'Neill, would have to await the restructuring of local government, timed to be completed in 1971, and then the Government would consider the matter.

This was not good enough. The pressure by the civil rights movement was increased. O'Neill dismissed his discredited Minister of Home Affairs, Craig; with the resignations of Faulkner and Morgan there were now three ex-Ministers attacking his administration. O'Neill, in order to overcome his difficulties, called a general election in February 1969.

The election revealed difficulties for the opposition parties and forces. It was not possible to win a united front in the constituencies. But disunity also afflicted the Unionist Party. There were pro-O'Neill and anti-O'Neill candidates. The Nationalist Party came out of the February election much depleted. Civil rights leaders, Mr. John Hume and Mr. Ivan Cooper were elected. The Socialist Republican Party, led by Mr. Gerry Fitt, retained one seat, lost one and captured another. The total of opposition MPs at Stormont was reduced from 17 seats to 13.

Since parliament convened, after the election, opposition MPs have acted in unison. The new O'Neill administration, faced with conflict between reformers and non-reformers, ran into difficulties and resigned. The battle was then on for the premiership. In the voting Chichester-Clark won by 17-16 over Faulkner. The price has been a high one for Chichester-Clark. He has included the most rabid opponents of reform in his Government, with the exception of Craig and West. He walks a tight-rope and would appear to be more insecure than O'Neill was. He made his first policy statement in the Commons (May 7). Its direction was correctly summed up

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by the *Irish Times* on May 8, when their correspondent, Fergus Pyle, wrote:

> The Northern Prime Minister . . . stuck to the middle of the road and dealt out commitments to the civil rights movement with reassurances to his own right wing.

A further body blow to the Unionist Party was the creation of unity of the opposition forces that enabled the return of a Unity candidate, Miss Bernadette Devlin, for the Westminster seat of Mid-Ulster. Unionists realise that, given unity, the opposition forces could take four seats at Westminster, and possibly five. In that event, their pretentions to speak for Northern Ireland, at Westminster, would be completely shattered.

The transformation of the political scene in Northern Ireland since last August is nearly unbelievable. Modest demands put forward by the Northern Ireland Civil Rights Association on behalf of the minorities have caused the downfall of a government and a prime minister; split the Unionist Party, once considered invulnerable and invincible and which was accustomed to pursue its merry way with complete disregard to local, national or world opinion. Moses could tap the rock in the desert and obtain water for the thirsty Israelites. No force, it appeared, before the autumn of 1968, could tap the rock of Unionism and obtain mercy and consideration for those whom it lorded over. Now the rock has not only been tapped—it has been split wide open. Forced, at last, to make concessions, its bona fides, as expressed in parliament, will be subjected to continual scrutiny. Its 'good intentions' and appeals for 'peace and calm' will be met with great reservation. Over half-a-million people have got off their knees and have cried 'We want more', and they have found allies in every quarter.

A big responsibility rests on the popular forces that have evolved to bring about the greatest unity of the greatest number of people. Co-operation has to be won with the trade union and labour movement. Unity of the opposition forces in the political sphere has also to be won, in word and deed, and inside and outside parliament. Unless this unity is won and the danger of a confrontation on sectarian lines, always a lifeline for the Unionist Party, is averted, the successes achieved and those still to be won, could be placed in jeopardy. Those who shout of civil war, or use similar expressions, display defeatism and doubt the ability of the people of Northern Ireland to win through to a situation where norms of life become the accepted thing.

This is our special task in Northern Ireland. In Britain we ask,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and require, the maximum support of the great trade union and labour movement in that country. We ask that the people concerned with the leadership of that movement will endeavour fully to understand and appreciate the struggle that is being waged in Northern Ireland. We wish, with all our heart, that they will press the Labour Government to carry out a review of the Government of Ireland Act, 1920, so that a Bill of Rights can be put on the Westminster Statute Book and guarantee civil liberties for all the people of Northern Ireland. The movement in Britain must fully understand that we do not require British troops—such troops have never guaranteed our democratic rights. They are rather an expression of the denial of such rights.

The spectre haunting the ultra-Unionists in Northern Ireland is fear of becoming part of a united Ireland. No doubt that is the 'real politics' of the Irish situation. But never again must reaction be allowed to use this fear as a reason for continuing to deny civil liberties to our people. Or ever again attempt to bludgeon the common people into accepting 'divine rule' by the Unionist Party.

GUYANA PROSPECT

Cheddi Jagan

(*The first part of this article, dealing with the general election in Guyana, appeared in the May issue of* Labour Monthly.)

THE University of Guyana, our high schools and government ministries are all infiltrated today by CIA spies, who pose as advisers and experts, and by Peace Corps personnel. Their purpose is to 'sell' the American way of life and the American free enterprise or capitalist system, to gather intelligence and to smear the People's Progressive Party (PPP) and socialism. Meanwhile, Guyana is having an ever-increasing stream of American evangelist crusaders, no doubt also financed by the CIA, like Billy Graham's Latin American Crusade. The main enemy, these Christian crusaders declare, is communism. Now and then, for good measure, they attack some of the ills of capitalism—not the system itself. All systems are bad, they add; politics and politicians cannot help the people—all the politicians have failed the people, only the return of Christ can save them! Religion in the hands of these 'Sunday Christians' is made into an opiate to withdraw the people from the path of struggle.

Other half-truths peddled refer to the lack of capital, an excessive birth rate and a small population as factors militating against

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

economic development. Thus the call for greater incentives to foreign investors, family planning and birth control, and integration and unity with the Commonwealth Caribbean.

The objectives of the US imperialists are threefold: to cast blame on the working class for the failures of the ruling capitalist class; to dangle fresh 'carrots'; to extend US hegemony—political, economic and military—over territories where British and other European competitors once held sway. The vehicles by which these objectives are to be attained are close association with the Organisation of American States and by Caribbean unity—a Caribbean Free Trade Area. Caribbean unity is held out as the only hope for viability and progress. Unity and integration are essential if the purpose is to break with imperialism and neo-colonialism. But this is not the kind of unity contemplated. What is projected is the strengthening of the position of foreign capital, particularly US capital.

That no fundamental change is intended in the Caribbean was clearly pointed out by the Incorporated Commonwealth Caribbean Chambers of Industry and Commerce after their delegation met the Trinidad Prime Minister and other experts and advisers. Throwing in the red-herring of communism, the delegation wrote:

> It was felt that the danger of communist infiltration in the area should not be regarded lightly and the earlier situation in Guyana was referred to. The delegation was asked to bear the problem in mind and to emphasise in their talks the importance of preserving the traditional system of free enterprise.

This cold war, witch-hunting attitude has resulted in a bankrupt Caribbean leadership, whose inadequacies were highlighted in the invitation to the British Labour Government to use force in Anguilla. A parallel in the early cold-war period was the support and praise by the Caribbean leaders for the gunboat suspension by the Churchill Government of our constitution and the ejection of our first PPP Government. The People's National Congress (PNC) puppets also resort to psychological warfare. They create the impression of invincibility, that they cannot be defeated. And they imply that, should the PPP win, there would be more disturbances and violence. Still fresh in the minds of the Guyanese people are the terrible days of 1962 to 1964 unleashed by the CIA, PNC and United Force (UF).

In the face of electoral fraud, economic, ideological and psychological aggression, a new era has now dawned. During the days of British colonialism, the PPP won three successive elections in 1953, 1957 and 1961 at more or less fair elections. But now, with massive electoral rigging, PPP supporters have had a rude awakening;

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

illusions have been swept aside. From a pre-election mood of confidence and optimism, there has developed a mood of pessimism and despair on the one hand and exaggerated aggressiveness, particularly among the youth, on the other. Such a situation tends toward right and left deviationism both of which are dangerous and have to be combated.

Right deviationism is rooted in the proposition that racial feelings are too deep, that the Afro-Guyanese will always support the PNC and that the PPP will never be able to get political power by winning or neutralising them. Therefore, it is argued, the PPP must change its image and make a compromise with the USA. (A variation on this theme is that I must step down from the leadership because of my avowed Marxism until the PPP gets power.) What kind of compromise? Would the USA agree to a non-aligned anti-imperialist Guyana? Would a US-backed PPP regime be allowed to go any further than the PNC-UF coalition or the PNC regime or any Latin American puppet state?

The answer is clear. Latin American misdevelopment, backwardness and poverty are the result of US tutelage and dictation. Even the much-publicised, but reformist, Alliance for Progress has failed. Mr. Dante D. Fascell, Chairman of the US House of Representatives Sub-Committee on Inter-American Affairs, in mid-February 1969 declared:

> I would be less than frank if I would not admit that the initial record of the Alliance for Progress inspires more gloom than satisfaction.

Pointing out that the *per capita* gross national product increase by 1.5 per cent was a little more than one half of the expected Alliance goal of 2.5 per cent, he said:

> I have serious doubts that this increase has had any significant impact on the masses of the people.
>
> At this rate of progress, Latin Americans who live at the edge of subsistence—whose annual income is estimated at about 200 dollars—will have to wait half a century to double the level of their standard of living.
>
> Furthermore, Latin America may have actually lost ground in such fields as education, housing, and food production when the growth in its population is taken into account.

Even India with a more liberal reformist policy is today in serious economic and financial difficulties!

If the right deviationists overestimate the role of race in politics, the left deviationists underestimate it. Any armed struggle now can lead to racial conflict and give the Government the excuse for

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ruthless suppression and for banning the PPP. What needs to be recognised is that by whatever means the PPP will win power, it can successfully do so only by breaking the racial and religious barriers and by increasing its mass support. Both race and religion have been used somewhat successfully by the ruling class in its divide-and-rule politics. The UF, using religion through church missions and schools in the interior, succeeded in subjugating and winning over a large section of the Amerindians.

The PNC has maintained the allegiance of the majority of the Afro-Guyanese, who constitute the main segment of the working class in the urban, mining and interior areas and in the strategic services—army, police, civil service, electricity, telephone, airport—by fear and demagogy: fear that the future of the Afro-Guyanese is imperilled not by foreign economic and cultural domination but by 'coolie' (Indo-Guyanese) domination; demagogy that the PNC, a socialist party, could not improve conditions for its working class supporters because it was hamstrung in the coalition Government by the pro-capitalist UF.

More recently, to counter the growing disillusion and dissatisfaction among the Afro-Guyanese community and to retain its allegiance, the PNC leadership has been resorting to racial symbolism and talk of racial identity—L. F. S. Burnham wearing an Afro-shirt, and Sydney King changing his name to Eusi Kwayana and urging others to adopt African names. (Sydney King, an ex-PPP ultra-leftist turned racist, recommended to the 1962 Independence Conference that Guyana should be partitioned into three zones—African, Indian and other.) The 'cultural revolution' call of King's African Society for Cultural Relations with Independent Africa is as far removed from revolution and culture as is the youth arm of the PNC, the Young Socialist Movement, from socialism.

The PPP sees the need, therefore, of getting its supporters to make a qualitative change in their outlook, to look at it not mainly as an electioneering party but to build it as a disciplined, ideologically-sound party for the purpose of waging a many-sided struggle and of meeting imperialist force with revolutionary force. In the coming months, emphasis will be placed on mass action and day-to-day struggles. The clear message now by the PPP is that there is no electoral road to power so long as the PNC Government controls the electoral machinery. Mass confrontation must take place at all levels in defence of living standards and constitutional rights. The puppet regime will be forced to respect the constitution or to set up an undisguised dictatorship.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The PPP will strengthen its work on the economic fronts to counter the role of the collaborationist labour leaders. Workers have to be mobilised to fight for better wages and working conditions on the factory front, and farmers to be organised to demand better prices on the farm front.

Marxist ideology and political and economic struggles are the means by which racial and religious divisions can be overcome and unity of the working class and other progressive elements can be achieved. Without such unity, the anti-imperialist battle cannot be won. Marxist ideology will help to bring about through scientific analysis a better understanding not only of the root causes of the ills of Guyanese society—falling living standards, growing unemployment, increasing crime and delinquency, mass emigration—but also for a new strategy of economic development which alone can make Guyana move forward. Such a strategy was set out in our electoral programme which called for:

1. Nationalisation of the commanding heights of the economy—foreign owned and controlled factories, mines, plantations, banks and insurance companies, and foreign trade.
2. Strict system of exchange control.
3. Emphasis on simultaneous industrial and agricultural development, mainly in the public and co-operative sectors.
4. Rent and price controls.
5. Land reform.
6. Trade with, and aid from, countries in both East and West.
7. Full democracy and mass participation at all levels.

Recent developments, such as those in Pakistan, Northern Ireland and Surinam against the regimes of Ayub Khan, O'Neill and Pengal respectively, are also reminders of what mass action can bring about. The PPP is maintaining close fraternal contacts with the revolutionary forces throughout the world, more particularly in the Caribbean and Latin America. It sees its success in the context of a world revolutionary upsurge; and its contribution in the creation of the broadest possible unity in Guyana, and in its solidarity with other 'third world' revolutionary movements, the socialist bloc and the progressive forces in the imperialist states.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Higher Education Curricula

FUTURE OF HIGHER EDUCATION

(One of the central questions of discussion in the field of higher education is that of the content of curricula. We have accordingly invited contributions from some spokesmen concerned in this field.)

Bob Williamson

Cancer Research Worker, Glasgow University

IT is necessary, in order to democratise higher education, to make it far more generally available to members of the community, not only in the sense that more and more people get a higher education (under socialism, I assume that every person will be receiving full or part-time education for the whole of his life, whether for purpose or pleasure) but also that universities open their doors on a casual basis to anyone wishing to come. Anyone at all should be encouraged to follow an educational pursuit on which they are keen enough to devote their time and energy, relevant to their work or not. (United States universities are far in advance of European ones in this type of experiment). Such a policy would also, of course, help the late developer or the victim of an inadequate schooling.

What then of exams and entrance standards? There is really no need for entrance standards in most subjects—several years of higher education at the nation's expense should be as much a right for those who want it as a school education, not to be granted solely on the basis of expected achievement at the end of it. (We do not, after all, force mentally retarded children from school at 5 or 6 years, whatever the medical opinion of their capabilities. How much more important not to discard normal people at 15 or 16, when there is virtually no evidence yet as to whether abilities at this age are inherited or environmental.)

However, there is a need for an 'exit standard'. Institutions of higher education have a responsibility to the community to see that people stamped as 'doctors' or 'engineers' or 'philosophers' know their trade. It is this assessment, and the related problems of administration, which pose a great problem.

The American system of course credits, where each year-long course is examined separately (using multiple and flexible methods of assessment) permits students to combine wider interests and, if they wish, to take a longer and more varied look at their subject than does our very traditional single examination system. Inciden-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tally, in my experience prejudice against individual students by examiners, even in political subjects, is extremely rare in British universities. The main fault of the present examining system is not its unfairness to the individual student (it operates far more often in the other direction) but the overall constraint it places on adventurous teaching and interpretation.

Assessment of staff should, of course, involve students, as well as other staff of all grades. Were it not for the tiny minority of mentally disturbed people who are deliberately cruel to others, it would be possible to hold public evaluation meetings every few years—most of us understand that everyone has his strong and weak points, and know our own limitations and are willing to discuss them. The diversity of approach and talents we welcome among students should also be welcomed among staff. Not all those with 'old-fashioned' ideas in their subjects are wrong. I think all members of staff, even those on the far left, are at times alarmed by a certain intolerance evidenced by some 'revolutionary' students. It is a tradition of the best of socialist thought that the battle of ideas is not served by silencing those with whom one disagrees, but by arguing with them.

Part of the inflexibility of our higher education is due to the proliferation of types of institutions. I think every form of higher education should be integrated with the universities—immediately for the colleges of education and technology and technical colleges. This will, of course, necessitate spending a lot of money on new buildings, for most of the present colleges are small and inadequate. Their staff and students should be added to the university faculties of education and social science, engineering, and so on. The staff would have to be retrained in some cases, but since this should be a recurring feature of all teaching in higher education it should pose no problems. It is particularly important that part-time education should be re-integrated with full-time education for the benefits it brings to the part-time student, and even more to bring the university into closer contact with practical work.

In all probability the 'faculty' (science, arts, medicine) will remain as a useful administrative division. The smaller 'department' now hinders rather than helps both teaching and research, most of which cuts across traditional fields of study. However, there is no need to be dogmatic about such matters, and there should be room for experiment. It goes without saying that administrative responsibility should be rotated amongst staff (and in some cases students as well) in a much more democratic fashion than at present.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A word on what is and is not possible. I work in a subject, cancer research, where very few institutes impose any discipline as to hours or days worked. In spite of this, the majority of the several thousand scientific and technical workers in this and related fields consistently work weekends, evenings and through parts of their holidays. The motivation for this is partly advancement, but is largely enthusiasm and self-motivation of the best kind, a desire to expand knowledge and help mankind. I have seen, in a few university departments, this enthusiasm transmitted to students so that their work becomes a pleasure and exams virtually irrelevant. We make far too little use of this fund of love for knowledge and for fellow man which runs very deep, through our young people especially.

Nick Wright*

National Union of Students Art Colleges Advisory Panel

DISCONTENT with the content and structure of art and design education in Britain formed the objective background to the widespread student (and staff) revolt in the art colleges during the summer term of 1968, and since then a whole range of proposals have been advanced in an attempt to initiate reforms. A joint committee of the main decision making bodies in art and design education, the Summerson Council and the Coldstream Committee (National Council for Diplomas in Art and Design—Chairman, Sir John Summerson; National Advisory Committee on Art Education—Chairman, Sir William Coldstream) has been considering evidence on organisation, structure and content, submitted by professional, teachers' and student organisations. The two main documents produced by the students were submitted by the National Union of Students (*Art Education: NUS Evidence to the Coldstream Committee*) and the Movement for Re-thinking Art and Design Education (*Evidence to Coldstream Committee*). The latter is a loose co-ordinating organisation based at the Royal College of Art; its main task is the collation and dissemination of information preparatory to its annual conference.

Both these documents draw on the experience of students involved in direct action against the authorities. Thus the proposals advanced

*Nick Wright was President of Hornsey College of Art Students Union during 1967, until he was expelled in autumn 1968 by the college authorities (the Tory Harringay Borough Education Committee), following the sit-in which was the start of the country-wide revolt of art and design students and staff.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

directly express the students' profound discontent with the prevailing systems of college government and both see the participation of students in the decision making process *at all levels* as an essential component of higher education.

The students at Hornsey College of Art set out their basic demands* as follows:

—the elimination of GCE entrance qualifications to art schools
—the implementation of a network structure of education
—the elimination of compulsory examinations based on 'academic' studies
—the elimination of the distinction between vocational and 'Diploma in Art and Design' courses

These demands constitute criticisms of features of art and design education that have developed since the radical reorganisation that followed recommendations from government committees in 1957. The main characteristics of this reorganisation were the introduction of inappropriate *verbal* tests (GCE's), both for selection and terminal examination, the division of courses into 'degree-equivalent' (Diploma in Art and Design) and low status 'vocational' categories, and the development of narrow specialisation and rigid departmentalisation.

The mandarins responsible for reorganising the system felt that their proposals would result in an increase in status for art education; they tried to remould art education in the image of the university by injecting a bogus respectability and a pseudo-academic content and in doing so they transplanted some of the most negative and irrelevant aspects of higher education.

In reality the demands that society (and students) make are in the opposite direction. The historical conditions that created the differences between fashion and textile design, furniture and industrial design, graphic design and painting and sculpture are disappearing. In all disciplines the trends in technique, style and materials reflect an increasing interpenetration.

Today, when the need is for flexible, versatile, interdisciplinary designers who can transcend the barriers imposed by narrow specialisms the colleges are producing students trained for obsolescence.

The Coldstream thesis that fine art (painting and sculpture) must play a central role has in practice meant that fine art departments have retreated into a self-imposed isolation where an emphasis is placed on the individual artist's highly subjective relationship with the art object, a relationship that reinforces a fetishism of art objects

* *Document Number 11* (Association of Members of Hornsey College of Art)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and effectively excludes designers from the whole sub-culture surrounding fine art studies.

The result: a design education that is neither academically satisfying nor vocationally viable, a fine art education that produces half-trained, alienated unemployables who just cannot relate to society, and a visual culture that attempts to deny social significance to the work of its most talented practitioners.

Willie Thompson

Post-graduate student of economic history,
Strathclyde University

UNIVERSITY authorities—even the most liberal of them—have sworn that two areas of academic life shall remain forever exempt from the influence of student power: staff appointments and control of curricula.

In Britain we have not reached the state of affairs where questions of curriculum control are negotiated at gunpoint, as happened in April with Negro students in the USA, but it is not difficult to understand the very high importance attaching to decisions affecting the curriculum. These play a significant part in determining the student's performance, the grasp and breadth of understanding he acquires of his subject and, while not primary, are still an important factor influencing his conception of social responsibility—his attitude towards his own behaviour as a citizen with specialist knowledge.

The apparent purpose of a curriculum in physics, engineering, medicine, economics or theology is to acquaint the student so far as possible with the current state of knowledge and discussion in that field and to train him to work competently in it. However it can serve other, less obvious, functions.

Of these, the most important is probably to act as a filter. In most university courses the first-year student has to cover an extensive range of courses—frequently five. The more of these a student must pass, the greater the chances of failing some of them and being excluded—a necessary requirement from the university's point of view since there are never enough places in subsequent years to accommodate the whole first-year intake. Thus, curricula complement the examination structure in ensuring a high failure rate in universities at the cost of an immense and unnecessary loss to the community and waste of scarce resources. It may be noted that where the authorities desperately need certain classes of qualified people the situation is

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

quite different. In colleges of education it is widely agreed that the curriculum and exams are designed to ensure the *minimum* failure rate.

Within the same university, different departments set enormously different standards. Engineering and science students tend to be grossly overworked with a weight of practical and laboratory tasks which makes theoretical study burdensome and social life impossible if the student wants a good degree. In the arts and social sciences the load is generally much less severe.

In the current crisis of British capitalism the courses in business and administration are of special interest. There are nearly 50 of these offered at different British universities and they vary immensely in standard. At Heriot Watt University, Edinburgh, for example, it is very broad, including studies in economic geography, social philosophy, general and economic history, while at Lancaster it is intensely narrow, almost entirely practical and includes such material as 'theory of games' and 'queuing theory'.

In none of these 40-odd universities is there a course on trade unionism, though many include 'industrial relations'; in none a course specifically on nationalised industry, and only one (Strathclyde) approaches this with 'control of business organisation in private and public sectors.' It is ironical however that there are more courses on the 'philosophy of science' in the business and administration faculties than in the 50-odd departments of philosophy in Britain, and only two of these same departments specifically study Marxism.

It has been asserted that when certain of the new technical universities were established, business interests providing some of the finance attempted to interfere with the curriculum, in particular to exclude certain courses in liberal studies to which they took exception. Such allegations are difficult to check, but E. E. Robinson, in *The New Polytechnics*, writes that

> some of the pressure which these firms brought to bear on colleges, particularly Rugby and Stafford, which they dominated, went close to infringement of academic freedom.

As monopoly capital tries to conscript increasing areas of social life into its service, the pressure for a 'rationalisation' of curricula can be expected to develop. If the academic stormtroopers who wrote the 'Black Paper' get their way there will be a 'cultured' syllabus for the elite and the most impoverished technical training for the rest of us educational serfs.

(Further contributions to this series on higher education curricula will be welcomed.)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

GHANA TODAY

Pat Sloan

'Ghana's younger generation will expect more dynamic and exciting policies before long, and failing them might be tempted by a new form of Nkrumahism.'

The Times editorial, April 11, 1969.

'Constituent Assembly . . . is devising a Ghanaian constitution to prevent a new form of Nkrumahism in national politics.'

The Times Accra correspondent, April 15, 1969.

THE above words have appeared recently in *The Times* following the forced resignation of General Ankrah, head of Ghana's 'National Liberation Council' (NLC), the junta which illegally seized power on February 24, 1966, as a result of a secret conspiracy of not more than seven army and police officers.

For three years the junta has been screaming about corruption under the legal Government and now, this April, the head of the junta has resigned after admitting receipt of £3,000 for political purposes from a foreign source. Allegations put the figure at nearer £15,000, a figure accepted by the BBC's *Focus on Africa* programme of April 5. The replacement of General Ankrah by Brigadier A. A. Afrifa, and the announcement of elections, make it timely to survey just what has happened over the past three years and what are the prospects now.

From the time of independence in 1957 Ghana gave a lead in the struggle for African unity. Internally, where before the Colonial Office had never allowed a Marxist book into the country, Kwame Nkrumah by the spring of 1965 publicly defined his doctrine, which he labelled 'Nkrumahism', as 'the application of scientific socialism to the African social milieu'; in effect, a non-capitalist path to socialism. In practice this meant the development within a mixed economy of a public (state and co-operative) sector more rapidly than the private sector, the beginning of industrialisation and state farming, and pressing ahead with education and health services on a scale that was the envy of independent Africa. A seven year development plan was in progress when the coup of 1966 occurred.

These developments were hampered by many obstacles: the working class was still small and mainly illiterate; literacy was a monopoly of a secondary school élite brought up in an African transplant of the public school tradition; tribal and extended family loyalties were strong despite Nkrumah's constant opposition to tribalism; material poverty was widespread, agriculture primitive (except for a few cocoa farms), transport facilities and adequate piped water lacking. In addition, cocoa was the country's predominant export.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Moreover, the political party of national liberation, the Convention Peoples Party (CPP), was a *national* party, not a proletarian party, though it stood for 'socialism'. Unfortunately, the evolution towards proclaimed support for scientific socialism was not accompanied by up-grading the working class influence within it.

As in every underdeveloped country (and as in Britain itself till well on in the industrial revolution), corruption was widespread and—by the refined standards of British corruption today—blatant. At the same time nepotism resulted from the survival of extended family and tribal tradition, though here in Britain nobody with a memory of the Macmillan Cabinet need go to Africa to seek the extended family at work!

While, on the one hand, the CPP and the Government aimed at socialism, in the private sector a 'get-rich-quick' class was developing from the same social elite that officered the army and police.

At the time of independence Ghana had large reserves earned from cocoa sales abroad when prices were high. After independence, cocoa prices fell far below expectations. When foreign currency was most needed for development, Ghana's main export slumped in price.

Allegations of extravagance have been made, as is normal with regard to all developing countries. But who is to judge? Ghana was building for the future.

By 1966 the fall in cocoa prices and the demand for resources for construction were forcing a rise in the cost of living. But such obvious achievements as the Volta dam and power station, a number of new enterprises, state farms, a high level of employment, free education, expanding health services, and improved roads and water supply were all indications of a positive road of development. There was a dynamic and orderly atmosphere in the country.

In this situation a handful of officers seized power while the President was on a peace mission to Vietnam. They replaced 'preventive detention' by 'protective custody' in the name of freedom. They then carried out a large number of arrests. Editors were arrested and replaced; a Rumours Decree was introduced after eight months to control their successors more effectively and then these successors were replaced and General Ankrah himself threatened the press.

The seven year development plan was abandoned, as well as many state enterprises; chronic unemployment, a rising cost of living, an unprecedented crime wave, prostitution, and economic stagnation followed. Corruption was rampant. Evidence for all these statements may be found in Ghana's most official newspaper, the *Ghanian Times*. Space alone prevents quotation here.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The abandonment of the seven year development plan meant jettisoning many state enterprises. Trawlers bought from the USSR lay idle for two whole years before being sold to private enterprise. A Chinese-built cotton factory was abandoned. A Hungarian-built pharmaceutical factory was sold to Americans to be worked on a more or less 50-50 basis, after an attempt to sell to Abbotts Pharmaceuticals had been thwarted by public protests. And only the other day we read that

> the State Farms Corporation is to close down its nine tobacco farms . . . The closure . . . will bring to about 44 (*sic*) the total abandoned by the Corporation since 1966 (*Ghanaian Times*, February 28, 1969).

And another writer said that state farms had been

> abandoned with unharvested crops (while) many are being sold to foreigners . . . We are signing off large tracts of land to foreigners . . . for many years . . . land which is the basic resource of the nation (*Ibid.*, April 1, 1969).

In industry one of the most significant cases of neo-colonialist penetration is the fact that the US Firestone Corporation has set up enterprises producing from rubber tyres and batteries to various agricultural crops. Of Firestone, Nkrumah had written that it had

> taken $160m. worth of rubber out of Liberia in the past quarter century. In return the Liberian Government had received a paltry £8m. (*Neo-colonialism*, p. 66).

Now Firestone is rampant in Ghana too.

Immediately after their coup the NLC appointed to be Secretary of the Ghana TUC the only Minister of the legal Government to have ratted. This man, B. A. Bentum, this year resigned from the NLC's 'Incomes Commission' in protest against pegging wage rises to five per cent while prices went uncontrolled. In view of his record, this means something.

In fact, industrial unrest has been permanent since the coup. In May 1968 the Commissioner for Labour, S. Y. Nettey, referred to the 'chaotic situation caused by irresponsible elements' (familiar phrase) and admitted that between 1961 and the coup (five years) there had been 51 strikes, while there had been 71 strikes, in less than two years, since the coup. Since then the police have shot three workers at the Obuasi goldmine.

Student unrest in Ghana has been marked since the coup—and secondary schools have been prominent. In addition, reports show that chiefs, farmers, the rural population of the north, and the Ghanaian small business people have all opposed the NLC on one or

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

more issues. Hence there have been several attempts at a counter-coup, in one of which the first head of the NLC, General Kotoka, was killed. At the moment, the chief of the armed forces, Air-Marshal Otu, is under arrest as a 'conspirator'.

Since the coup, neo-colonialist inroads have been encouraged, and even an 'African' youth seminar has taken place at the University of Legon at which the only European power represented was West Germany. This may indicate that Ankrah was a Germanophile but his successor, Afrifa, is certainly not that. Here are a few extracts from Afrifa's little book of 1966, *The Ghana Coup:*

> I have been trained in the United Kingdom as a soldier and I am ever prepared to fight alongside my friends in the United Kingdom . . . (Sandhurst) is an institution that teaches that all men are equal . . . I personally knew that Her Majesty's Government of the United Kingdom was quite capable of dealing with the Rhodesian situation . . . Our chiefs are known to be our natural rulers . . . African unity is a glorious ideal, but I know that this is impossible to achieve within our lifetime (pp. 111, 51, 104, 115, 111).

In the jockeying for power when 'civil rule' (with police licensing every meeting) is restored, a number of figures appear to be in the running as potential party leaders. Dr. Busia, defeated by Nkrumah, is said to be about to head a 'Progress Party' (he is also thought to be closest to Afrifa). His main rival is regarded as being K. Gbdemah, a former CPP organiser who became an oppositionist. Dr. J. Bilson of the University is said to be working for a 'Third Force', and Mr. Bentum, on behalf of the TUC, says that it will make up its mind at the beginning of June about a 'Labour Party'. One former Minister of the legal Government, I. Egala, Minister of Industry, who since the coup has done his stint in 'protective custody', is also said to be forming a political grouping (*West Africa*, April 26, 1969).

Light on the character of the 'lifting of the ban on political parties' since May 1, and the 'elections' announced to be held, is thrown by the new regulations now issued (*Financial Times*, April 29, 1969). According to these new regulations everyone who held any responsibility under the legal Government, either nationally or in the regions, is banned from standing as a candidate. Such is the NLC's trust in Ghana's democratic choice—if it were allowed one!

PASS IT ON ...

When you've finished reading this copy of Labour Monthly, why not pass it on to a friend or workmate?
You might gain us a new reader — especially if you point out the generous post free subscription rates printed inside the back cover.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOKS

The Philosophy of World Revolution
Franz Marek
Lawrence & Wishart, 138 pp., 21s.

FRANZ MAREK the Austrian Marxist and a member of the Central Committee of his Party has written a challenging book on the great importance of developing Marxist theory so that it remains a real guide to action in relation to the ever changing policies of contemporary socialism as it faces the new situation and new opportunities of the times. It might at once be said: But we *have* our theory, and it has been stated repeatedly from the first to the last of the writings of Marx and Engels, again in Lenin, and even in our day we have our excellent contemporary restatements of the basic principles. These are well known and we all accept them. What is the problem?

But that is not so; as all Marxists know, Marxism itself has ceaselessly developed and had to develop with a changing situation. Its effectiveness, especially in the periods of revolution following the first and second world wars, was only due to the radical modification to face a world situation never envisaged by Marx and by Engels. Had it been no more than the Marxism of the *Communist Manifesto* or *The Critique of Political Economy* (Preface), there would have been no socialist Russia today.

Of course certain basic essentials remain; but Marxism has always been more than a statement of principles, a doctrine. It is and has always been a guide to action.

Thus Lenin himself developed the theory of the transition to socialism, and the undeniable key role of the Party. He also made it clear that there was no inevitable uprising of the working class in the sense that their own clear consciousness of the world situation did not matter and spontaneity was all.

Marek appears to be unnecessarily puzzled over this question of inevitability. Surely Marxism has never believed that events would move irresistibly forward independent of our understanding of them and the conscious willed action that follows. Any fatalistic interpretation of inevitability is and always has been entirely contrary to the Marxism not only of Marx but of Plekhanov, Lenin and the whole movement down to the present day.

It is a pity that Marek does considerably less than justice both to Engels and to that very great Marxist Plekhanov. It was Lenin who declared that Plekhanov should be required reading for every Marxist. A new and more lively and at the same time scholarly and philosophical Marxism for our day would be the better for a fresh study of his works, too often neglected.

But the clearer our understanding of first principles the more necessary will it be for us to do more than use the formulations of earlier times in equipping the trade union and labour movement for its present tasks; this does not provide us with our theory and our strategy. Just as the situation confronting Lenin in 1917 required *a fresh development* of Marxism, not a repetition of existing formulations, so does the situation with which we are confronted today.

Marek works this out historically and in great detail, through the unprecedented post-war situation in Eastern Europe right down to the present situation in Western Europe (and the Third World). He combats the view of some Marxists who have no confidence in the working class movement in the West and regard the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

revolution as possible only in backward countries. He points out how often we have had to pass over certain stages of development which Marx thought inevitable and he discusses the new developments of Marxist theory required for the effective operation of a peaceful transition to socialism, and the united working of more than one progressive party to this end.

We have neither to defend a dogmatic form of Marxism, as not to be tampered with as against the actual situation, which is the policy of some Marxists; nor have we to try to incorporate this reality into the dogmatic conception, as Trotsky did. Reality has always proved richer and more colourful than any initial concept. For that reason contemporary programmes need more than a repetition of old slogans. We still need a full Marxist theory to respond to all the new developments of a changing situation. Failing that, our programme may be tactically sufficient, but it will be ideologically insufficient. Our practice will be divorced from real theory.

Whatever the weaknesses in Marek's book, he has performed a valuable service in stimulating discussion and emphasising the importance of carrying forward Marxist theory to be adequate to meet the constant new problems of the modern world situation.

JOHN LEWIS

Select Bibliography of the History of the British Labour Movement 1760-1939

Edited by Edmund Frow

History Group of the Communist Party, 34 pp., 4s.

THIS IS A SECOND EDITION correcting some errors in the earlier edition of 1961 and including new works since then up to the Spring of 1968.

The World Beyond the Charter

C. Wilfred Jenks

Allen & Unwin, 200 pp., 40s.

AN AMERICAN JOURNALIST once told me how, when he was sent as correspondent to one of the socialist countries, he was instructed by his editor to 'report objectively from the Western viewpoint.' That description describes very well the approach in this book, by the deputy director-general of the International Labour Office, to the efforts to apply the Covenant of the pre-war League of Nations and the Charter of the United Nations. Dr. Jenks is sincerely devoted to the ideals of both, and he warns in the most emphatic terms that 'peace will not preserve itself because of the balance of terror, or because no one in his senses desires war, or because we are wiser and more civilised than our forefathers.' But he does not analyse the underlying reasons for the failure of both the League and the UN. I have seldom read a book so fully documented or so full of quotations, nor one which ignores so completely whole aspects of the subject.

There is no reference in his account of the events leading to the second war to Litvinov's long campaign for complete disarmament. He does not deal with the way the Covenant was flouted by the support given to Nazi Germany by Britain and France because they regarded Hitler as their weapon against Communism and 'the bulwark against Bolshevism.' There is no reference to the use of 'non-intervention' to ensure the victory of the fascist powers over the legal Government of Spain, nor of the green light given to Mussolini in his Abyssinian war. He does not refer to the offers of a collective front against Nazi aggression at the time of Munich and during the Anglo-French discussions in Moscow on

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the eve of war, which were sabotaged by the Chamberlain Government. He does not mention that the dying League of Nations, which failed to take action against the fascist aggressors, roused itself to expel the Soviet Union at the time of the winter war in Finland, though history proved that, if the Mannerhein line had not been demolished, Leningrad could not have held out and not only Russia but Britain would have been in infinitely greater peril.

His only comment on the Soviet Union's membership of the League is that it 'did not mature into a mutually acceptable relationship.'

The same failure marks Dr. Jenk's account of the post-war period. He does not assess the significance of the unanimity rule (or veto) which was sponsored by Roosevelt because it was clear that the great powers must agree on a way of peace. In his acceptance of the view that the Korean war was a UN campaign, he does not even mention that the United States acted unilaterally.

Dr. Jenks shows a sad lack of understanding of the situation in Europe when he suggests a solution based on admission to the UN of the Federal Republic of Germany and of China, with Taiwan and the German Democratic Republic put on the same footing, and offered membership either on the basis of reunification or separate membership after elections under UN supervision. If Western observers, with the knowledge of events of Dr. Jenks seriously believe that the GDR or her allies would accept a solution which ignores the dangers of revived German nationalism in the Federal Republic, the chances of peace and coexistence are poor indeed.

Peace and indeed survival of mankind in the 'world beyond the charter' must depend on acceptance of coexistence between different social and economic systems and the right of all peoples to choose their way of life. Dr. Jenks has produced a useful book of reference but hardly a contribution to this aim.

GORDON SCHAFFER

Hegel's Science of Logic

Translated by A. V. Miller

Allen & Unwin, 844 pp., £5

HERZEN used to call Hegel's dialectic 'the algebra of revolution'. Lenin always insisted that the study of Hegel was the essential foundation for the serious understanding of Marxism. It is characteristic of the backwardness of theoretical development of British educated circles that Hegel's principal work, his *Science of Logic*, written between 1812 and 1816, was not available in an English translation until 113 years later, in the two-volume version by Johnston and Struthers, published in 1929. What had previously been available, translated by William Wallace and published under the title *The Logic of Hegel*, in 1874, was in fact only the chapter from the *Encyclopädie* known as the 'Shorter Logic'. Now there has appeared a new translation by a lifelong student of Hegel, A. V. Miller, who claims that his translation is more accurate and has been able to make use of new research during the intervening forty years. Some of the features of the old familiar well-thumbed two-volume version of Johnston and Struthers are no longer available in this edition, notably the valuable Glossary setting out in parallel columns the German special terms used by Hegel and the English equivalents adopted in the translation. There is no doubt, however, that this new version is likely to become recognised in future as the standard version of Hegel's *Science of Logic*.

R.P.D.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A POWERFUL WEAPON

GEORGE McCREADY, District Secretary of the Scottish Commercial Motormen's Union, writing from Glasgow, tells us that a grand total of 61 extra copies of *LM* were sold to delegates at the Scottish TUC in April. 'We would have sold more,' he says, 'but for the fact that so many of the delegates are regular *Labour Monthly* readers.'

As if in answer to anyone who thinks of *LM* as a high priced luxury, his letter ends with: 'Thank you for the offer of one third discount but you can put it to better use than I can. We toyed with the idea of selling them at that price but came to the conclusion that at 3s. 6d. the delegates were getting a bargain.'

Our Fund figure this month has improved but is still short of our £100 monthly target. Regular contributors from London, Liverpool and Cardiff send their comments with their donations 'to help the Fund and mark our appreciation of your services to the labour movement'—'to *LM*, our most powerful weapon in the struggle against imperialism and war'—'We shall need *Labour Monthly* more than ever during the stormy days which lie ahead.'

These unfailing friends are the guarantee of *LM*'s continued service to the labour movement.

NICOLA SEYD

£81 13s. 11d.

REGULAR DONATIONS came from: 'Highgate Reader', £3; A. Allen, £5; 'Oliver Twist', 10s; Cambridge Union C.P., 10s; *M. Morgan, 5s; H.L. (USA), £10; M. Bell, £2; J. Rink, 5s;* E. Strachan Rogers £1 1s; Southend Branch, £1; J.D. (Canada), £2 17s. 6d; W.E. Rounce, 5s; 'S. Mill', £1; B.D., £1; B. Ainley, 10s; L. and S. Perkins, 5s; the Butcher family, 10s; H. Brindle, 5s; Les Bates, 5s; Blackburn Branch, 3s; Oldham Branch, 2s; L'Humanité, 5s; John and Jenny Pinkerton, 5s; R.F.B., £3; A. Corbett, £1; Marie Philibert, 5s; G.I. 1s. 6d; E. Sheldon, £1; R. Paul, 10s; T. Crichton, £3; 'Pax', 5s; L. Hadfield, 5s. 6d; K. Kokos and friends, 15s; J. Roose Williams, £1 1s; R. McLeod, £2; S. Morrissey, 10s; J. Purton, 7s. 6d; E.J.B., 10s; Socialist Sailor, £2; B. and K.R. (USA), £2 9s. 1d; A.M.T. (for Fernando and Guilherme), 1s.

OTHER DONATIONS include: E. Oglesby, £1; F.G. Hoyal, 5s; J.R. Woolf, £1; D.R. Morrison, £1; B. Strachan, £3; *S. Jones, 10s. 6d; R. Lang, 10s; E. Pountney, 10s; A. Moffat, 5s; D.S. Browett, 10s;* W.C. (Australia), 16s; In Memory of S. Lea, £10; J.W.R. Clark, £3; D. Lumsden, 5s; J.B.B. (Canada), 10s; P.G. Husbands, 10s; K. Bickley, 10s; In Memory of Glyn Williams, £5; W. Ward, 10s; E.K.F. (USA), 8s. 4d; J. Paton, £1 10s.

Our thanks to you all,
Co-op No. L99482

134 Ballards Lane, London, N.3.
01-346 5135

Published by Unity Publications (Finchley), Ltd., and printed by London Caledonian Press Ltd. (T.U.), Watford, Herts.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

POST FREE SUBSCRIPTION RATES

Home and Overseas	1 year	£2 0 0
(Unsealed envelope)	6 months	£1 0 0
USA	1 year	$6.00
	(sealed	$9.00)
	6 months	$3.00
Canada	1 year	$6.50
	(sealed	$7.50)
	6 months	$3.25

Air Mail rates quoted on application

Please start my subscription from the

..... issue

Name.....

Address .....

Special Students' Concession

1 year	£1 15 0
6 months	17 6

I am a bona fide student at

.....

Please start my subscription from the

..... issue

Name.....

Address .....

.....

.....

PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

The Atlantic Commonwealth, George E. G. Catlin. Penguin Books, 116 pp., 4s. 6d.

Critics of Society, T. B. Bottomore. Allen & Unwin, 144 pp., 15s.

The Woman Movement, William L. O'Neill. Allen & Unwin, 208 pp., 35s.

The Siege of Leningrad, Harrison E. Salisbury. Secker & Warburg, 636 pp., 84s.

An Economic History of the USSR, Alec Nove. Allen Lane, 416 pp., 55s.

Politico-Economic Problems of Capitalism, Y. Varga. Progress Publishers Moscow (Central Books), 350 pp., 18s.

Japan Surges Ahead, P. B. Stone. Weidenfeld & Nicholson, 206 pp., 45s.

Theories of Surplus Value Part 2, Karl Marx. Lawrence & Wishart, 662 pp., 30s.

Scottish Nationalism, H. J. Hanham. Faber & Faber, 250 pp., 36s.

The Political System of the United States, John D. Lees. Faber & Faber, 380 pp., 60s.

Criminal Liability Without Fault, Professor T. Brian Hogan. Leeds University Press, 26 pp., 2s. 6d.

The Road to War, Walter Laqueur. Penguin Books, 456 pp., 8s.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PAMPHLETS

Still a few copies available of:

U.S. CHEMICAL WARFARE
by Prof. E. H. S. Burhop 6d

INDIA IN TRAVAIL
by R. Palme Dutt 1s 0d

WHITHER CHINA ?
by R. Palme Dutt 2s 6d

Order from:

134 Ballards Lane, London N.3 or
CENTRAL BOOKS
37 Gray's Inn Road, W.C.1

For all interested in the fight for Peace and Progress in the Countryside and the problems of Socialist Agriculture.

THE COUNTRY STANDARD

Quarterly 6d. By post 9d.

Annual Subscription 3/- post free or send 3d. stamp for specimen copy.

THE COUNTRY STANDARD
27 Bedford St., Strand, London, W.C.2

MIMETTE FURS LTD.

Wide range of furs, coats, stoles and capes.

117 High Street, Croydon, Surrey
'Phone CROydon 4328

ORDER NOW!

Labour Monthly Bound Volume for 1968

Price £1 15s. 0d., post free, or send 15s. 6d. and your loose copies as soon as possible to:

LABOUR MONTHLY
134 BALLARDS LANE
LONDON, N.3

LABOUR RESEARCH

STRIKES:
FACT AND FANCY

FIRMS' POLITICAL GIFTS

CHILDREN IN TROUBLE

1s. 6d., or 1s. 10d. by post

LABOUR RESEARCH DEPARTMENT
78 Blackfriars Road, London, S.E.1

CLASSIFIED ADVERTISEMENTS

(4s. a line, minimum 12s. Cash with order to: 'Class. Ads.', Labour Monthly, 134 Ballards Lane, London, N.3.)

SOCIALIST LIBRARIES & pamphlets bought. 01-876 7254. Hammersmith Books, Liffords Pl., S.W.13.

ACCOUNTS OF and statements by Meth. & Ang. churches *re* CPGB & TU movt. 1914-1968 required for doctoral study by N. van Vuuren, Hist. Dept., Univ. of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa. 15213

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED